

REMARKS

Before the present amendment claims 45-49 were pending in the case. All of these claims remain pending in the case. The drawings have been amended as described above and on attached replacement sheets.

The Office Action and Responses Thereto

Rejection Under 35 USC §103

In the Office Action claims 45-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang '99 et al. "Rule Mitigated Collaboration Technology", IEEE, p. 137, p. 142, Dec 1999 (hereinafter " '99 Reference"), in view of Chang '97 et al, "Research on Collaboration Net", 6th IEEE Workshop on Future Trends of Distributed Computing Systems 1997; pp. 228-33 (hereinafter " '97 Reference"). The Examiner states that the '97 Reference discloses a client server collaboration distributed system that uses an internet session and floor control rules, such as Robert's Rules of Order ("RRO"), and a colored petri net to model an extended RRO. The Examiner further states that the teachings of the '99 Reference, when combined with the teachings of the '97 Reference, render the current invention obvious to one skilled in the art.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. As mentioned in the immediately previous response, Applicant respectfully contends that the '99 Reference does not qualify as prior art under §102. However, as Examiner correctly pointed out, Applicant failed to provide a declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 stating that the teachings of the '99 Reference were derived solely from the Applicant so that the '99 reference is not the invention of another. Please consider the declaration accompanying this response that states that the conception and reduction to practice of the invention claimed in the present application was made solely by the named inventors.

Moreover, the declaration also demonstrates that the '99 Reference was published less than one year prior to the filing date of the instant application. As a result, '99 Reference does not pre-date the filing of the current invention by more than one year. For the reasons set forth in Applicant's prior response, the '97 Reference is insufficient, by itself, to render the current invention obvious. Specifically, the '97 Reference fails to teach means for allowing mitigation of a set of protocol rules within a meeting environment; an object based client-server architecture for supporting a meeting environment and means for allowing mitigation of the set of protocol rules; a set of application program interfaces which allow communication between said protocol mitigation means and the meeting environment; or an electronic meeting that takes advantage of a network's capacity to handle multiple simultaneous communication channels. As a result, the '97 Reference fails to teach or suggest the current invention as claimed, and Applicant respectfully requests the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. If for any reason the Examiner still finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (310) 500-3596 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

You are hereby authorized to charge any fees due and refund any surplus fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-2899. Please reference matter number 91522.900100

Respectfully submitted,

LINER YANKELEVITZ SUNSHINE & REGENSTREIF

Date: 4-Jan-07

By: /Stefan J. Kirchanski/
Stefan J. Kirchanski
Registration No. 36,568
Attorney for Applicants

1100 Glendon Ave., 14th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90024
Telephone: (310) 500-3500
Facsimile: (310) 500-3501